



EAST COUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

October 6, 2015

The Honorable Isiah Leggett
County Executive
Executive Office Building
101 Monroe Street, 2nd Floor
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear Mr. Leggett,

On behalf of the East County Citizens Advisory Board (ECCAB), I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present to you the support and endorsement of the County Executive's Transit Task Force Public Draft and Recommendations.

The Transit Task Force has worked and produced a report that we feel has addressed the issues raised by the citizen in the Spring 2015 public forum regarding the enabling legislation being requested at the General Session in Annapolis for an Independent Transit Authority (ITA). The issues (in no particular order) order were:

- 1) the organizational transfer issue as it pertains to the county government's Department of Transportation and Ride-On services and labor issues,
- 2) the exceeding of charter limits on property tax,
- 3) the appropriate separation of the ITA from the county government in regards to the county's debt obligations,
- 4) the acquisition of real property through eminent domain,
- 5) the lack of public input and process,
- 6) the lack of accountability to the public and elected officials, and
- 7) the determination of how the proposed ITA would be measured and audited as it pertains to the performance of financials, operations and services expected set in the institution of this independent authority.

In addressing the perceived lack of transit authority accountability to the public and elected officials, the recommendations contain the makeup and term limits of the governing board of the ITA and the appointment authority by the Council and Executive. The Council will also have the authority to remove members of the governing board for cause. By requiring the ITA to submit a multi-year capital improvement program for Council consideration and approval, as

ECCAB-10/6/15

well as provide the Council the power to require the authority to submit an operating budget for both the internal operations of the authority and for the operations of the transit programs provides for sufficient oversight by the county over the authority.

The proposed authority not being able to take real property through the exercise of eminent domain until reviewed by the Council through its CIP and budget approval process, consistent with Title 12 of the Real Property Article of the State Code and with the County Master Plans provides for sufficient controls to manage the exercise of eminent domain of real property by the authority.

In regards to the financing of the authority, authorizing the County to create special taxing districts with the limitations of a maximum tax rate raised and that any tax set by the authority is subject to disapproval by the Council, with an accompanying process of negotiation and possibly revert to a tax level just needed to cover debt services on outstanding bonds provides sufficient controls over the authority to protect the financial interest of the county. In authorizing the authority to impose excise taxes with a maximum tax ceiling limit and subject to the disapproval of the Council, with an accompanying process of negotiation and possibly revert to a tax level to the preceding year limit again provides sufficient controls over the authority to protect the financial interest of the county and its businesses.

The requirement by Council for annual independent financial audits and regular management audits will ensure that the authority has sufficient internal controls, plus these audits are to be submitted to Council and published for public review will provide the needed measure of 'eyes' on the authority and how it runs its business. An additional requirement for performance metrics will also provide indications on the efficacy and efficiency of the authority's operations. This is in line with the required participation of the authority in Montgomery County's Open Government Initiative to a level consistent with existing Executive Branch agencies.

The Task Force working with Municipal and County Government Employees Organization (MCGEO) arrived at an acceptable solution where the protections afforded by the county to existing transit staff is protected, the function continues to stay with the county government, and continue to enjoy the applicable County collective bargaining law.

Finally, in reference to the biggest issue expressed by the citizenry, the Task Force recommended creating a structure allowing revenues generated for the purpose of supporting the County's transit program to exceed current Charter limits subject to limitations to the aforementioned tax matters and more fully described in the Task Force's Public Draft Report and Recommendations, but with restrictions on the amount of special property tax that may be imposed.

ECCAB-10/6/15

The Transit Task Force has done an admirable job in addressing the issues raised by the citizens, businesses, civic and business organizations and submitted sound and workable recommendations. The East County Citizens Advisory Board supports the Transit Task Force Public Draft Report and Recommendations.

Sincerely,



Anthony Ramirez

Chair, East County Citizens Advisory Board

cc: Jewru Bandeh, ECRSC Director
Councilmember George Leventhal, MC Council President
Councilmember Tom Hucker, District 5
Councilmember Nancy Navarro, District 4

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 5:03 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 9:03:09 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Yun bai
Email: Baiyunyi@hotmail.com
Comment: No BRT

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 3:23 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 7:22:49 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: John Webster

Email: gocapresident@gmail.com

Comment: The Greater Olney Civic Association (GOCA) passed this resolution opposing the ITA on March 10, 2015: <http://www.goca.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/GOCA-RESOLUTION-on-ITA-Proposal-031315.pdf> Please enter GOCA's resolution into the Transit Task Force's record as a public comment. Thank you, John Webster President, GOCA

Thanks

GOCA RESOLUTION
Montgomery County Independent Transit Authority (County Bill 24-15)

Whereas the County has proposed a new politically-appointed Independent Transit Authority (ITA) with unspecified borrowing and eminent domain powers; and

Whereas the ITA will not be directly accountable or transparent to County voters; and

Whereas the ITA proposal separates County decision-making and prioritization for transit projects from road projects; and

Whereas the ITA disenfranchises County elected officials; and

Whereas GOCA supports carefully informed planning and fiscal management with full accountability and transparency to the voters; and

Whereas the County proposes to grant itself the power to impose special taxes without limitation to fund County transit functions; and

Whereas the Greater Olney Civic Association (GOCA) is on record strongly opposing any special taxing of residents for transportation projects with broad regional benefit; and

Whereas ITA debt will ultimately be the responsibility of County taxpayers through the aforementioned special taxes; and

Whereas the ITA will have power to exceed the County's authorized debt limits; and

Whereas the County still has debt obligations remaining from a debt burden that recently threatened its AAA bond rating

Now therefore be it resolved that GOCA opposes the creation of the ITA as currently proposed. Furthermore, GOCA strongly urges the County's elected officials to pursue transit projects in a fiscally responsible manner with full and direct accountability and transparency to County voters by adhering to the following general principles:

Transit projects shall be funded by existing Federal, State, and County funding methods and not by special taxes or bonds that exceed existing authorized borrowing limits

Transit and road projects shall both remain the direct responsibility of the County Executive, who is the elected official responsible for deciding trade-offs and prioritizations for all transportation projects and expenditures

Transit projects shall be developed in fiscally responsible phases with proof of operational viability, ridership, and ongoing fiscal self-sufficiency being requirements for proceeding to the next phase of development

Transit projects shall not proceed beyond the conceptual stage without first obtaining documented and published citizen input and a citizen's referendum on the final proposal

#####

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 1:15 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 5:14:50 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Qiang Zeng
Email: property14814@gmail.com
Comment: I am strongly against BRT.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 1:07 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 5:07:10 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Hui ouyang
Email: Huiouyang2003@yahoo.com
Comment: I against the BRT strongly

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 1:07 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 5:07:00 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Hui ouyang
Email: Huiouyang2003@yahoo.com
Comment: I against the BRT strongly

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 10:11 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 2:10:55 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Linda jin
Email: lxjin01@yahoo.com
Comment: No,strongly again

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 9:52 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 1:52:10 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Garrett Hennigan
Email: garrett.hennigan@waba.org

Comment: TESTIMONY OF THE WASHINGTON AREA BICYCLIST ASSOCIATION ON THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY EXECUTIVE'S TRANSIT TASK FORCE DRAFT REPORT Members of the Task Force, Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the draft report and the proposed transit authority. My name is Garrett Hennigan and I am the Grassroots Advocacy Coordinator for the Washington Area Bicyclist Association. For all of the reasons outlined in the draft report, the proposed Rapid Transit System (RTS) has enormous potential to solidify Montgomery County's economic future with greater access to jobs, greater mobility, and more attractive, bikeable and walkable communities. By taking advantage of current shifts in mode share, a strong Rapid Transit System can coax commuters out of their cars with more transportation options. Deliberately building this system into bicycle networks and emphasizing bicycle access will only magnify these shifts. This summer, the Montgomery County Planning Department kicked off a refresh of the countywide Bike Master Plan, which will lay out a comprehensive network of low-stress bikeways. Unlike previous efforts, the aim is build a network for that majority of people who are interested in biking, but concerned about the roads they must travel on. Low stress bikeways are how we grow bicycle trips. Since we only have so many streets, the bicycle network and RTS network would and should overlap. As we have seen with Metro, good bike access to transit stations extends the effective range of transit and enables more multi-modal trips. Outside of stations, protected bike infrastructure and bus guideways can and should coexist on the same roads. If designed with protected bike lanes and deference to existing plans from the start, the RTS and bike networks can complement each other well. To achieve this level coordination in the end result, RTS governance must be accountable to existing and ongoing planning efforts. To avoid operating in a separated silo, planning, design and operation must be a deeply cooperative effort with county planning and transportation agencies. Speed of implementation is important, but achieving the best result is crucial. Thank you.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 9:40 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 1:40:14 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Jenny Wang

Email: Jennylz_wong@hotmail.com

Comment: I strongly against the proposal, as this won't benefit the community in Clarksburg area.
I'm currently reside in Clarksburg and I love the area!

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 9:28 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 1:28:05 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Jasmine Wang
Email: jasminexgw@yahoo.com
Comment: No

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 9:12 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 1:11:41 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Yifei Xing
Email: dxwj@hotmail.com
Comment: No BRT

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 9:11 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 1:10:47 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Tianning Li
Email: li_tianning@hotmail.com
Comment: no

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 9:04 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 1:03:43 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Kairong Cui
Email: Cuiusda@hotmail.com
Comment: No BRT

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 2:43 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 6:42:40 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Suna Wang
Email: suwang3609@gmail.com
Comment: No!

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 10:55 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 2:54:39 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: yenny
Email: jenny_login@yahoo.com
Comment: No, it is not a good ideal.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 10:34 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 2:34:13 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Li cui
Email: Cuililiu@hotmail.com
Comment: No

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 10:25 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 2:24:57 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Viviana
Email: Vivideproano@email.com

Comment: I do not support this plan I live in Clarksburg and rush time is terrible we need alternative routes, like the one planned years ago that motivate me to buy a home expecting what is was planned

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 9:45 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 1:44:48 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: ting chau

Email: chaumei@hotmail.com

Comment: I strongly against the plan to raise tax for a very unrealistic nor effective public transit plan. Especially for up county community Clarksburg that won't benefit for another 50 years.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 9:14 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 1:13:35 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Don Slater

Email: slater402@verizon.net

Comment: I would like to voice my support for the BRT program. We need more and better transit options in the county. Too many people are riding in cars alone.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 8:08 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2015 12:07:48 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: xihao

Email: lixih99@yahoo.com

Comment: As a resident in Clarksburg MD I do NOT support the RTS or BRT system. It's going to be a waste of taxpayer's money because I think not enough population will benefit from it.
Thank you.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 7:55 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2015 11:55:21 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Kausik Ray
Email: raykausik@hotmail.com

Comment: As homeowner at Clarksburg, MD, I think BRT is not beneficial and would not resolve any traffic long term traffic issues. No construction planning has been in place to reduce traffic backups in Clarksburg and M83 is voted down. I will not support any official Up for election supporting BRT and depriving Clarksburg residents for the construction of M83 road ways.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 4:31 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2015 8:30:41 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Glenn Ford
Email: Gmfpanda@gmail.com

Comment: This is a terrible idea. I will not support any government official who supports this plan.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 4:23 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2015 8:22:34 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Avadesh Gulati

Email: deshugulati@yahoo.com

Comment: I am opposed to the RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM. I am a current taxpayer in who resides in Clarksburg, MD and I will not receive benefit form this project. We need to build more roadways not establish more public transportation in northern Montgomery County. This project will not relieve the traffic situation in Clarksburg and should not be looked at as an alternative to building the necessary roadways we need to accommodate growth in the area.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 4:04 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2015 8:03:22 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Xiuzhu Yang
Email: yangxiuzhu@gmail.com

Comment: I have not seen much success for any bus route. Rail is the solution. Rail will make this area more lively.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 4:04 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2015 8:03:14 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: wei liao
Email: liao_wei_2000@yahoo.com
Comment: I am a resident of Clarksburg. I am strongly against this proposal.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2015 1:45 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2015 5:44:34 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Cherian Eapen
Email: cherianeapen@hotmail.com

Comment: The need to develop transit infrastructure within Montgomery County is critical, but the current urgency to build a Rapid Transit System (RTS) through dedicated taxation only on Montgomery County residents is not justified. It is well-documented that a significant portion of vehicular traffic and resulting congestion on Montgomery County's State highway routes, along which the proposed RTS will ultimately reside, provide regional mobility and access to commuters from all over the region, including Washington, Frederick, Carroll, Howard, Prince George's Counties in Maryland and many as far away from Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Quite simply, the multi-jurisdictional and multi-State impact of this regional commute and travel pattern on our roads is a responsibility of the State of Maryland. Planning and implementing a local transit authority to address a regional congestion issue with taxes on local residents is not a good policy. Therefore, I urge the Transit Task Force to recommend to the County Executive to delay implementation of the RTS and other immediate new big-ticket transit investments. I urge the County to first complete its master-planned roadway infrastructure, and then to strengthen its land use and transportation policies to significantly increase mixed-use density and enhance multi-modal accessibility within our urban core areas, Metro Station Policy Areas, and activity centers that are already served by existing and proposed transit, and look into reasonable staging requirements that does not require untenable transit investments in areas such as Great Seneca Science Corridor and White Oak Science Gateway. For the above reasons, I oppose the proposed ITA.

Thanks

**Hillandale Citizens Association
Silver Spring, Maryland
Comments Before the Transit Task Force
September 30, 2015**

The Hillandale Citizens Association actively participated in the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan and the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan. We support additional development and improved transit for our area, including the New Hampshire Avenue corridor. Funding these dreams has always been the challenge, and over the years many promises were made, chief among those were that development would provide the money.

Recently, Council President Leventhal framed the discussion in a holistic manner. Given the County Executive's warning of a large property tax increase in the coming year, the Purple Line funding questions, and the lack of certainty on the design and cost of four of the five RTS routes included in the TTF report, more thought, more time and far more outreach to all stakeholders should be given to this very significant policy proposal.

It is time to hear from the County Executive.

- Is Mr. Leggett advocating a \$2.2B, five-corridor system to be built over the next ten or more years?
- Does Mr. Leggett believe that this added debt service is affordable for the county, while he's advocating for greater restraint in the county budget?
- Does Mr. Leggett believe that relying heavily on residential property taxes to support this huge project fair and equitable?
- Why has Mr. Leggett's Task Force declined to thoroughly review alternative funding mechanisms, such as a per-employee fee, or a per-dwelling-unit fee, higher commercial property tax rates and development-specific charges?
- And what about a broader regional approach? Success of several routes will be only possible with regional cooperation, why not regional money?

We are anxious for Mr. Leggett to engage broadly with the community on these points.

Thank you.

Eileen Finnegan
Zoning and Planning Chair
Hillandale Citizens Association

HillandaleCt. Assoc

Montgomery County Council Press Releases & Statements

Testimony

Montgomery Council President Leventhal's Remarks on Rapid Transit

- Release ID: 15-284
- Release Date: 9/21/2015
- Contact: Neil Greenberger 240-777-7939 or Delphine Harriston 240-777-7931
- From: Council Office

Montgomery Council President Leventhal's Remarks on Rapid Transit

Today at Rapid Transit Roundtable, He Emphasized 'Taking a Step-by-Step Approach to New Projects or Risk Losing the Already Tenuous Public Support for Transit'

ROCKVILLE, Md., September 21, 2015—Montgomery County Council President George Leventhal, speaking today in Rockville about Rapid Transit at the Rapid Table Roundtable sponsored by the White Flint Partnership, said, "I believe BRT offers great promise, but we must take a step-by-step approach to new projects or risk losing the already tenuous public support for transit."

Council President Leventhal went on to say, "Fundamentally, we must restore the public's confidence that we have a government that works. I am optimistic that we can get there, but we must lead with results that improve our constituent's day to day lives, not with talk of tax increases from which the public does not perceive a benefit."

The complete text of Council President Leventhal's remarks today:

Bus Rapid Transit is critical to the County's economic and transportation future, but we have to adopt a realistic time horizon and we must be cognizant of the current public attitudes toward transit. We have been promising the Purple Line for decades, and while its construction looks more likely than ever, it still hasn't broken ground. Meanwhile, upcounty residents are patiently waiting for the Corridor Cities Transitway to give them an alternative to driving, and we have neither a clear financing plan nor a consensus on who is in charge, the state or the county.

Hillandale Cit. Assn.
Testimony

Unfulfilled promises have hurt the cause of transit, but the project which has done the most damage to the public's perception of transit is the Silver Spring Transit Center. The only transit project that has been constructed in recent memory is the transit center, and fairly or unfairly, it has come to define how our residents view public infrastructure projects. The transit center debacle has eroded public confidence that government can build something even more ambitious and visionary. Any time I talk to a constituent about a big infrastructure project, whether it is transportation related or not, the transit center invariably comes up as an example of why it can't be done.

Too many of our constituents have lost confidence that we have a government that works.

Moreover, hardly a week goes by that there isn't another news story about the dysfunction and breakdowns that plague our Metro rail system. The public is bombarded with negative and unflattering news stories about transit, which has left a bad taste in people's mouths about the merits of a transit-focused future. The public is rightly skeptical that we can build a project with the size and scope of the Purple Line.

We haven't hit bottom yet, either. Public skepticism of transit is only going to grow once Purple Line construction begins. Have no doubt, the five-year construction period for the Purple Line will be long and painful. Once the trees begin coming down and huge trenches are dug through our already congested streets to make way for the Purple Line, the public will second guess the decision to build it. Forcing a public conversation on how to fund BRT in the midst of Purple Line construction, and before we have fixed our current infrastructure or built even one project that has been in the planning stages for years, will set us back considerably in the effort to convince residents to leave their cars at home.

I believe BRT offers great promise, but we must take a step-by-step approach to new projects or risk losing the already tenuous public support for transit. The first and most immediate priority of county government should be to restore confidence in transit, and the best way to achieve this is to engage with the state to make the user experience on the Purple Line the best that it can be—By incorporating innovative public art along the route, making the stations welcoming landmarks and by providing quick, reliable service. If the passenger experience on the Purple Line isn't satisfactory, it will kill any public support that transit still enjoys among riders who have the option of driving their cars.

Once the Purple Line has broken ground, we should immediately determine how the Corridor Cities Transitway will be paid for. Johns Hopkins University has a lot at stake with that project, and I hope the university will come to the table with a financing plan including substantial commitments from the property owners who stand to benefit. In addition, I am not ready to give up on state funding for the Corridor Cities project. If the current governor is unwilling to commit his support for it, it will be an election issue in 2018.

The County's transportation vision has always been bigger than its budget, but we need a reality check on the fiscal challenges that County government and its

Inv. with Hillandale CitizensAssn
Testimony

residents face in the near term. A huge property tax increase is being proposed for the coming fiscal year just to keep the lights on. The County is also grappling with the fiscal impact of the Wynne Supreme Court decision, the State's Maintenance of Effort funding requirement for public schools and the teacher pension shift from the state onto the counties. In addition, the County must now determine how it is going to pay its additional \$40 million contribution for the Purple Line, and WMATA needs a huge cash infusion from local jurisdictions just to keep it functioning at a basic level of service, let alone easing overcrowding on station platforms and adding eight-car trains during rush hour, which our constituents are demanding.

Over the next two years, more detailed plans will be developed for the Route 355, Route 29 and Veirs Mill Road BRT lines. Each of these projects offers great promise and is a County priority. Within two years, we should have a much better defined scope and cost estimate for each. Once we know how much these lines will cost, we should develop options to pay for them, perhaps involving a combination of federal and state funding, special tax assessments on commercial property owners who will benefit directly from the lines and some revenues assessed equitably from all taxpayers.

Fundamentally, we must restore the public's confidence that we have a government that works. I am optimistic that we can get there, but we must lead with results that improve our constituent's day to day lives, not with talk of tax increases from which the public does not perceive a benefit.

####

» [Return to Press Releases](#)

[Privacy Policy](#) | [User Rights](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Language Translations](#) | [Social Media](#) | [County Code](#)

Copyright 2015. Montgomery County Government All Rights Reserved.

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Saturday, October 03, 2015 9:44 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Saturday, October 3, 2015 1:43:53 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Barbara Ditzler
Email: bditzle@yahoo.com

Comment: I completely support BRT, but after hearing all the testimony on Wednesday, those opposing BRT did have an idea; to make Ride-On free. Just suppose we painted one lane for buses only and made Ride-On free. Think of how many people would get out of their cars and ride the free bus!

Thanks

White, Julie

Subject: FW: 2-10-2015FW: The ITA and the CCT

From: Donna Baron [mailto:baron2233@verizon.net]

Sent: Friday, October 02, 2015 11:06 AM

To: Ike Leggett <Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov>; Bridget Newton <bnewton@rockvillemd.gov>; Jud Ashman <jud.ashman@gmail.com>

Subject: The ITA and the CCT

Mr. Leggett, Ms. Newton, Mr. Ashman,

The Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) is always mentioned as one of the proposed Independent Transit Authority's reasons for being and I'm not surprised that the County feels it will need an end-run around the residents to fund it.

From Clarksburg to King Farm...the full length of the CCT...there is minimal community support for the CCT. State and County officials admit, in private, that nobody is expected to ride it. We've been told the CCT is not for commuters...aka the residents. The alignment is long and convoluted so it would take forever to get from any Point A to Point B. There is little or no parking at the stations even though most residents north of Montrose Road need their cars to get out of their subdivisions. The projected ridership numbers are ridiculously high and apparently the state doesn't have the tools to come up with more realistic projections. The current alignment neglects to factor in the construction of the interchanges at Sam Eig Highway and Great Seneca or a second left turn lane onto Great Seneca from Muddy Branch north. The alignment on Muddy Branch Road will cause automobile and pedestrian havoc, if not complete gridlock. The cost of the CCT will likely be in the vicinity of \$1 billion once all the costs are tallied. Yet the state is charging ahead with the engineering work for the long convoluted alignment and the fancy genome-related design of the kiosks.

This billion dollar boondoggle is simply a very expensive marketing tool for Johns Hopkins' ill-gotten property, Belward Farm, which is adjacent to four established suburban neighborhoods and will always be 5 miles from the nearest Metro station. Hopkins is a very wealthy organization and can well-afford to pay for its own shuttle, just like many other corporations and universities, instead of expecting the state and Montgomery County to foot the bill.

Pull the plug on the CCT. It makes no sense to anyone and the cost will be prohibitive.

Best regards,

Donna Baron

Coordinator, The Gaithersburg – North Potomac – Rockville Coalition, online at www.scale-it-back.com

Richard Parsons



**Statement to the Transit Task Force on the Proposed Montgomery County
Independent Transit Authority: OPPOSE**

The Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance supports the creation of a new, well structured, transit authority to provide additional dedicated revenues to meet pressing transportation needs, and we support the use of bus-rapid-transit (BRT) to add new capacity in heavily congested corridors where studies indicate it would be effective, including the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT). However, we do not support the proposed Independent Transit Authority (ITA) recommended by the Transit Task Force for the following reasons:

1. **This ITA Proposal is Not Well Structured – Falls Short on Many Fronts:** This Independent Transit Authority proposal is focused too narrowly on a \$2.2 billion local BRT system (dubbed "RTS" or Rapid Transit Service) that will not meaningfully address the County's most pressing transportation needs; has not been subjected to the standard alternatives analysis that is generally conducted prior to making any investment of this magnitude; **it imposes significant new tax burdens on all County taxpayers for benefits that are not clearly defined and are limited to a few property owners and residents;** and it may make traffic congestion worse instead of better, if implemented as currently proposed. More specifically:
 - a. **Focus is Too Narrow, Too Local, Too Limited to be Effective:** The ITA proposal is limited to funding a purely local BRT network that does not address Montgomery County's dominant travel patterns, which are regional and suburb-to-suburb in nature (40% of Montgomery County resident workers commute out of the County every day, and a similar proportion of County jobs are filled by non-County residents – some 200,000 workers per day commute into the County from around our region – few would use a local RTS; and the vast majority of daily trips in our region, in any scenario, will not be using transit); fast-changing technology may require more flexibility than this structure allows; and the proposal fails to address the County's worst traffic bottlenecks;
 - b. **System Performance Data is Lacking:** Performance data for auto and transit travel times in each corridor and countywide – comparing conditions with and without this system in place – have not been made available to the public to justify this extraordinary level of new taxation. Since roughly 90% of daily trips in suburban Maryland are on our roads (roughly 10% use other forms of transit), data on both modes is critical for making informed investment decisions of this magnitude, especially since the proposed network would convert current general purpose lanes to bus-only use in some already highly congested corridors; yet this critical data has not been provided;
 - c. **No Comparative "Alternatives Analysis" to Justify this Level of Prioritization & Funding for Local BRT:** No comparative traffic modeling analysis has been done at the regional or county-wide level to justify an investment of over \$2.2 billion in a purely local BRT network, as opposed to other master-planned projects that are likely to deliver better results and should be higher priorities. For example, adding regional BRT service on the new electronic toll lanes planned for I-270, from Frederick to the Beltway, and across the American Legion Bridge (which studies show dramatically reduces congestion for roughly 500,000 residents per day, expands transit access, and largely pays for itself) has been identified by transportation experts as a much higher priority;
 - d. **Ridership Gains are Unclear, RTS Duplicates Existing Transit Service on Ride On & Metro:** Ridership forecasts for the proposed RTS system assumed a more extensive network than is now included in the proposal (which only funds Phase 1 of the proposed RTS system); therefore, it is unclear what the operating costs and impacts of the current plan will be for County taxpayers.

Richard Parsons

Most of the projected riders of the more extensive local RTS system initially proposed currently use Ride On, Metro bus or Metro rail (in the case of lower MD 355). It is unclear how much benefit would be afforded these riders in travel time savings, or new transit riders generated per dollar spent, with the reduced Phase I RTS network, compared to other options; or if other less costly approaches to reconfigure bus routes, improve existing bus service in these corridors, and increase parking capacity around existing transit stations would perform better at lower cost;

2. **ITA Has Far-reaching Taxing Authority, but No Accountability for Performance:** The tax impacts of this proposal are significant – raising taxes by up to \$380 per year on residents and imposing even higher burdens on commercial properties through a combination of property and excise taxes, in a jurisdiction already known for high taxes. Higher taxes might be warranted, even in this context, if tied to specific improvements in the performance of our transportation network; however, there are no performance metrics specified or required to be followed by the proposed ITA in developing and prioritizing the RTS corridors now being studied. There is no assurance to taxpayers that this investment will materially impact congestion, transit ridership, access to jobs and housing, and other commonly used performance metrics; and therefore **there is no accountability for results** under this structure. Other regional transit authorities (including Virginia's) have such metrics and are required to follow them.
3. **County Can Use Existing Authority for Local RTS Corridors:** There are significant economic and transit benefits associated with portions of the proposed RTS system, especially in certain corridors where major economic development or re-development efforts will boost job growth and grow our tax base; but **Montgomery County does not need an ITA to begin work in any of these corridors.** It already has the authority to create special tax districts, as it did in White Flint, and can continue to do so on a corridor-specific basis as these projects move forward and are adequately evaluated for cost-effectiveness.
4. **Circumventing County Charter Limits:** The ITA's taxing authority (through a combination of property and excise taxes) sidesteps the county charter limit on property taxes in ways that voters are likely to perceive as contrary to the voters' intent (as expressed via referendum). It would also impose a significant new tax burden on all County residents and businesses for benefits that are poorly defined and largely confined to a small number of developers and very large property owners in the few corridors that will be served. **Each household will pay up to \$380 per year, on average, for the next 30 years, to fund the first phase of the proposed RTS system, if the ITA is approved.** If this system could be shown to reduce congestion costs significantly, voters might consider that cost reasonable, but that case has not been made.
5. **Who will Protect Property Owners from the ITA?** The power of eminent domain would be given to the Authority, but who would protect property owners to ensure they would be adequately notified, fairly compensated and that this authority is not abused? These questions need further clarification.
6. **Overly Complex Financial & Administrative Structures Needed:** The ITA creates potentially duplicative and complex administrative and finance structures that may lead to new inefficiencies and would have to be both:
 - a. Independent enough from County authority to assure bond rating agencies that its bonds do not count against County borrowing limits, and
 - b. Dependent enough on County authority to assure voters that its decisions are ultimately accountable to elected officials and, therefore, the voters.

There is an inherent conflict with this structure that the most recent ITA Task Force has struggled diligently to address, but it is a difficult challenge no other local jurisdiction in America has solved (there are no precedents for a local ITA anywhere in the U.S.) – so there is little real-world guidance available.

Richard Parsons

7. **Existing Revenue Authority, or New Regional Transit Authority, Offers More Proven & Successful Model:**

There are better (i.e. more impactful, more commonly used, and simpler) methods available to achieve the goal of creating a new source of dedicated funding for local and regional transit services, among them using existing revenue authorities or creating a new regional transit authority (like Northern Virginia has done quite successfully for somewhat similar purposes). This regional approach is the option that EVERY other jurisdiction in America has chosen – without exception – when faced with similar challenges. Regional authorities' bonds clearly fall outside a locality's borrowing limits because the geographic boundaries differ, with or without the complex administrative and financial structures a local ITA requires. A regional transit authority also:

- a. Provides much more new revenue (at least \$580 million a year);
- b. Is able to invest in much larger, multi-jurisdictional BRT and other transit projects that address regional and local traffic flows far more effectively, and can draw on a much wider range of revenue streams (beyond property and excise taxes) to fund them;
- c. Spreads the tax burden more equitably across the region (with lower tax rates over a broader base); and
- d. Is not wholly dependent on property taxes in one jurisdiction to fund improvements to a transportation network that is inherently regional.

Senator Thomas V. "Mike" Miller proposed legislation to allow for the creation of regional transit authorities in 2013 and similar legislation is anticipated in the next session.

8. **Some BRT Corridors Show Real Promise, but a More Incremental Approach – Using Existing Financing Structures and Greater Value-Capture through P3s – is a Better Way to Go.** Studies of each RTS corridor should continue. However, because the county-wide benefits are not well defined or established, a more incremental funding approach is warranted at this time. Using existing tools the County already has available – including public-private-partnerships (P3s) and special tax districts – can provide real benefits, and allow the County to proceed on at least as fast a timetable. It makes sense to begin with the Corridor Cities Transitway, which offers significant job growth, has its own dedicated right-of-way, and has already gone through extensive traffic modeling, performance, cost-effectiveness and alternatives analysis. Other RTS corridors, like lower MD 355 and Route 29, should also move forward on a project-specific basis, to keep important redevelopment projects in these corridors on track, as the County continues to advance its other higher-priority projects (like the Purple Line). This incremental approach has the added advantage of allowing us to focus on a more limited number of projects, get them done, and then evaluate their actual performance before committing \$2.2 billion to a system that remains untested. **Again, none of this requires creation of an ITA.**

For these reasons the Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance does not support the ITA and respectfully urges County leaders to focus on priorities that have more impact on congestion, greater accountability for results, and less impact on our wallets.

SMTA appreciates the time and effort the Transit Task Force has put into this proposal and remains committed to working with County leaders to identify a more effective approach.

Owners from the ITA? The power of eminent domain would be given to the Authority, but who would protect property owners to ensure they would be adequately notified, fairly compensated and that this authority is not abused? These questions need further clarification.

6. Overly Complex Financial & Administrative Structures Needed: The ITA creates potentially duplicative and complex administrative and finance structures that may lead to new inefficiencies and would have to be both: a. Independent enough from County authority to assure bond rating agencies that its bonds do not count against County borrowing limits, and b. Dependent enough on County authority to assure voters that its decisions are ultimately accountable to elected officials and, therefore, the voters. There is an inherent conflict with this structure that the most recent ITA Task Force has struggled diligently to address, but it is a difficult challenge no other local jurisdiction in America has solved (there are no precedents for a local ITA anywhere in the U.S.) – so there is little real-world guidance available.

7. Existing Revenue Authority, or New Regional Transit Authority, Offers More Proven & Successful Model: There are better (i.e. more impactful, more commonly used, and simpler) methods available to achieve the goal of creating a new source of dedicated funding for local and regional transit services, among them using existing revenue authorities or creating a new regional transit authority (like Northern Virginia has done quite successfully for somewhat similar purposes). This regional approach is the option that EVERY other jurisdiction in America has chosen – without exception – when faced with similar challenges. Regional authorities' bonds clearly fall outside a locality's borrowing limits because the geographic boundaries differ, with or without the complex administrative and financial structures a local ITA requires. A regional transit authority also: a. Provides much more new revenue (at least \$580 million a year); b. Is able to invest in much larger, multi-jurisdictional BRT and other transit projects that address regional and local traffic flows far more effectively, and can draw on a much wider range of revenue streams (beyond property and excise taxes) to fund them; c. Spreads the tax burden more equitably across the region (with lower tax rates over a broader base); and d. Is not wholly dependent on property taxes in one jurisdiction to fund improvements to a transportation network that is inherently regional.

Senator Thomas V. "Mike" Miller proposed legislation to allow for the creation of regional transit authorities in 2013 and similar legislation is anticipated in the next session.

8. Some BRT Corridors Show Real Promise, but a More Incremental Approach – Using Existing Financing Structures and Greater Value-Capture through P3s – is a Better Way to Go. Studies of each RTS corridor should continue. However, because the county-wide benefits are not well defined or established, a more incremental funding approach is warranted at this time. Using existing tools the County already has available – including public-private-partnerships (P3s) and special tax districts – can provide real benefits, and allow the County to proceed on at least as fast a timetable. It makes sense to begin with the Corridor Cities Transitway, which offers significant job growth, has its own dedicated right-of-way, and has already gone through extensive traffic modeling, performance, cost-effectiveness and alternatives analysis. Other RTS corridors, like lower MD 355 and Route 29, should also move forward on a project-specific basis, to keep important redevelopment projects in these corridors on track, as the County continues to advance its other higher-priority projects (like the Purple Line). This incremental approach has the added advantage of allowing us to focus on a more limited number of projects, get them done, and then evaluate their actual performance before committing \$2.2 billion to a system that remains untested. Again, none of this requires creation of an ITA. For these reasons the Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance does not support the ITA and respectfully urges County leaders to focus on priorities that have more impact on congestion, greater accountability for results, and less impact on our wallets. SMTA appreciates the time and effort the Transit Task Force has put into this proposal and

Rich Parsons cont.

remains committed to working with County leaders to identify a more effective approach.
Thank you.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Friday, October 02, 2015 10:46 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2015 2:45:32 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Richard (Dick) Jurgena
Email: rjurgena@comcast.net

Comment: I was the last person to testify at the hearing on 9/30/15. I was asked about my testimony regarding the cities who had scrapped BRT. My statement was based on the following: 1. Fresno City Council Slams the Brakes on BRT |... 1. D.C. officials radically scale back streetcar... 1. Transit referendum: Voters say No to new Metro Vancouver ... - CBC <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/transit-referendum-voters-say-no> <http://www.tennessean.com/story/news/local/2015/01/22/nashville-mta-amp-dead/22172861/> <http://chicago.suntimes.com/auto-show/7/71/887130/express-buses-return-ashland-western-ashland-brt-dead> https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/virginia-politics/arlington-officials-major-announcement-on-columbia-pike-streetcar-project-at-noon/2014/11/18/ce2a8170-6f38-11e4-8808-afaa1e3a33ef_story.html <http://chi.streetsblog.org/2014/06/24/cdot-delays-central-loop-brt-indefinitely-had-promised-2014-launch/> Before proceeding with the current BRT proposed systems, I think it would be a matter of due diligence to investigate these city's experiences and that of Houston before attempting what even our own consultants tell us may be an overwhelming task.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 4:21 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2015 8:21:09 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Jeremy Martin
Email: jeremymartin@gmail.com

Comment: Dear Transit Task Force, Thank you for the opportunity to testify today in support a bus rapid transit system and in particular in support of getting started building it right away. I live in Rockville, where my family and I get around by car, bike, train and bus. I serve my community as a member of the Rockville Traffic and Transportation Commission and the Pedestrian Safety Task Force, I represent the Maryland Municipal League on the Montgomery County Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee and serve on the MD 355 South Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Advisory Committee. I am also the Maryland Co-chair of the Citizen's Advisory Committee to the Transportation Planning Board. My personal experience and public service make it clear to me how important a first class transit system is to the economic vitality and quality of life of our community. Successful development in the region is clustering around transit, and building a world class transit infrastructure will be essential to draw the kinds of development we want in a very competitive environment. My parents are thinking of moving to the region, and they are looking for less car dependent community as they age, and building a first class BRT down the Rockville Pike will make the community attractive to them, and they in turn will make it more profitable for local businesses. The Transit Task Force Draft proposal makes a strong case for a new BRT, and for the role of an independent transit authority to build it. I encourage County leaders to examine this idea carefully. Everyday I bike to the Rockville Metro Station en route to my job in DC. A couple weeks ago I spent some time talking to people at the bus stops there about the BRT. I spoke with lots of different people, using the bus for different purposes, but they all recognize the importance of efficient reliable and rapid transit for their daily lives. Building dedicated lanes on the most important routes will ensure the bus is an attractive option, rather than a last resort, and this is what will drive ridership and reduce traffic as residents of the county have more transportation choices. My experience on the Rockville traffic commission shows that there is not much more we can do to push more cars down the rockville pike. We need to invest in attractive efficient options including a BRT. Building a BRT will improve conditions for transit riders, but also for drivers as transit takes drivers off the road. And of course local merchants and restaurants will benefit as well. A first class system needs station platforms level with the bus floor to make the system attractive, efficient and accessible. This accessibility is especially important to me because my daughter is in a wheelchair. Everyday a bus from the county school bus

Jeremy Martin - 10/11/15
continued

blocks traffic on my street as it lowers its lift and brings her chair onto the bus, I am very grateful for this service, but I as I look to the future, I would like to see a system that allows people in wheelchairs to roll right onto the bus. Building a first class system will avoid the expense of deploying busses with lifts and other accommodations that are awkward for riders and slow down the efficient operation of the system, as the people waiting on my street for the bus can attest. As a transit rider, a father, son, and citizen working for safer streets, I urge you to move forward expeditiously with a first class BRT system. This is an investment that will make the County work for me, make it accessible to the elderly and people with disabilities, and make it a vibrant community my children will want to call home 15 or 50 years from now.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 6:25 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2015 10:24:59 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Paul Seder
Email: pseder@verizon.net

Comment: Transit Task Force Testimony September 30, 2015 BRT implementation needs to be gradual to adapt to major factors (below) that will diminish future BRT demand. Costly overbuilding in excess of demand will increase taxpayer and auto owner opposition. 1) Reduced Federally Related Employment. Future growth in the Social Security, Medicaid and other Medical assistance programs is generally staffed from the Baltimore area rather than from Montgomery County. To offset these rising Federal expenditures, funding for other programs including those in Montgomery County might be reduced. 2) Decreased local travel due to telework, substitution of Internet purchases for store shopping, use of Uber-type services instead of owning a car (or 2nd car), online grocery delivery, and online home entertainment. 3) Special impediments to BRT use. In the 355 South Corridor WR has an annual 1,000,000 patient visits. Most of these are by car in non-rush hours. There is minimal road congestion and ample WR parking. Because a large portion of these visits involve children, handicapped or elderly who require a companion driver, it is unlikely that many of these trips would be made by BRT. In addition, Metrorail will detract from BRT use in this corridor. Gradual BRT implementation. In the 355 South Corridor, sign-designated BRT lanes southbound in morning rush hour and northbound in evening rush hour could be employed rather than concrete partitioned lanes. BRTs would have transit signal priority, as proposed. BRTs and other vehicles could use curb lanes in non-rush hours and the non-designated lane during rush hour. Outside of rush hours traffic and transit demand is typically moderate. Non-rush hour metrobus and Ride On buses typically have few passengers (e.g. six or less) at a time. Generally, US BRT systems have reduced non-rush hour service. Based on actual experience with the above implementation, in future years BRT changes could be made if necessary. Written testimony of Paul Seder, Ph.D., 5450 Whitley Park Terrace, Suite 104, Bethesda Maryland (just off Route 355) 301-530-7773 pseder@verizon.net He was formerly chief of all NIH Planning. Dr. Seder contributed to the Walter Reed Hosp. (WR) Strategic Plan and BRAC discussions on transportation. He gave County, MNCPPC, NIH, and WR testimonies on BRT related issues. His analysis of gridlock and op-ed article on energy conservation were published in the Washington Post. He has made thousands of Route 355 South bus, Metro and car trips.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 8:27 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2015 12:26:45 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Lisa Cline
Email: lisajeane@aol.com

Comment: My name is Lisa Cline of 420 Upshire Circle in Gaithersburg, Maryland. I am here to represent regular taxpayers — none of which have made it to where you all sit. None of us have made it onto the Transit Task Force team, which I will decompose in a moment. But to begin with, the Public Draft that we are here to talk about tonight is extremely hard for regular folks to find. This meeting is extremely hard for regular folk to find. A document that could profoundly impact taxpayer paychecks should be delivered to homes and disseminated via press releases to local newspapers. It should be presented in brief, clear language as an executive summary. One-time English-only dinnertime forums like this tell taxpayers that you really don't want our input. If you want our tax dollars, you're going to have to earn it to a certain degree. Take a cue from the Bicycle Master Plan folks led by David Anspacher. They are out there peddling their proposals at multiple meetings, repeatedly emailing clear concise map-driven messages and soliciting feedback you can almost see incorporated in real time. Secondly, the recommendations in this Draft are created almost exclusively by those with a vested financial interest in building BRT in throughout the County. Even the so-called Community Representatives on the Task Force, of which there are ONLY six, are anything but unbiased, unaffiliated or objective: Dan Wilhelm "Die Hard Transit Guy," I am told; was on the original Transit Task Force Francoise Carrier Former Planning Board Chair (!) Praj Kasbekar Senior Project Manager with Montgomery Housing Partnership Susan Burkinshaw Hopkins Alum Bill Kirwin Is this the same person that was Historic Preservation Commissioner? Peter Myo Khin East County Citizens Advisory Board — an Ike Leggett approved position Are these truly "community" representatives, representing all of us? This further proves the autocracy at work here. I am also informed that the Chair of the Transit Task Force is a personal friend of Mr. Leggett's. These factors make our transportation governing body either flawed or rigged. Yes, we are paying attention. Please rebuild this Transit Task Force to represent everyone. Half of you should be daily riders of BRT, and I am guessing you all drove here tonight. The lack of democracy is disappointing. Until I see that we are all represented in future transportation decisions, I cannot endorse any of these Task Force's findings.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 8:50 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2015 12:49:34 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Kevin C. Coates

Email: kc@coatesconsult.com

Comment: There is nothing "rapid" about bus rapid transit. To get people to abandon the use of their cars, much higher average speeds will be necessary than what buses can achieve. This is yet another attempt at "transit on the cheap" and it will fail precisely because of its low average speeds. I do not know who is advising the county on this initiative, but much higher average speeds are necessary to get people to choose transit over driving a car.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 3:36 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2015 7:35:35 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Art Slesinger
Email: aes44.busn@gmail.com

Comment: A new, independent transit authority is an uncontrolled authority and is a really bad idea. The County Executive's plans for a County Transit Authority are a disaster. It is repeating the same mistakes of the past and doubles down on a growth position that has failed.

Note: 1. In the last decade no new major employer has found Montgomery County acceptable. High taxes and government spending are frequently cited as the reason for going to Virginia. 2. State and Federal money sources have evaporated but the existing transit systems are woefully under-capitalized. The Metro is running 40 year old cars which should have been replaced. The County's own Mobility document shows dozens of intersections and roads in need of improvement. Taking away more resources will make the current systems even worse. 3. This independent authority makes it clear the County will circumvent its own agreements and statutes to spend money whenever it views it necessary. This leads to zero credibility as a responsible government. Any new employer will not trust the County not to find new ways to fund its expensive dreams at the employer's expense. New employers will not even look this way, they will simply avoid the County. More over, attempting to hide the new authority from the County's credit rating is of questionable morality. 4. All the plans and actions to allow unchecked growth have only added more demands on the County's budget and the falling average wage in the County is a clear signal we are headed the wrong way. Saying we need more transit to attract growth is a mirage and a failed policy. 5. The CCT is another false hope, it will, at best, in 20 years by MDOT own projections, only remove 15,000 cars a day. But since there is no local parking, the reality is there is little lowering of total car trips. It also suffers from being an outdated growth concept. Large corporate centers with thousands of employees are becoming obsolete. Belward Farm may never become a 4 million square foot center and it certainly will not while the 500,000 square foot Human Genome building remains vacant. Incurring billions in debt for an unpredictable transit outcome makes little sense. Executing an independent transit authority is a slap in the face to the tax paying public and will only lead to a major tax burden to subsidize these "white elephant" projects. Darnestown Civic Association Arthur Slesinger

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 9:34 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2015 1:33:38 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Kathryn Chiariello
Email: kchiariello@hotmail.com

Comment: I was born and raised about three blocks from Viers Mill Road, and currently live about three blocks from 355. I know firsthand how these two corridors are traffic ridden, pedestrian unfriendly, and generally lacking alternatives to single car travel. I believe Montgomery County needs BRT along these routes-- and elsewhere. We need a robust BRT system--as soon as possible---with features like dedicated lanes, off-board fare paying, adequate bike and pedestrian facilities, and frequent, reliable service. Together with better pedestrian and bicycle planning, BRT can help keep the county a vibrant and attractive place in which to live, work, or invest. I think everyone here recognizes that it will be expensive to build a true BRT system. However, the opportunity costs of not investing in this infrastructure are even higher. We need a BRT system so that Montgomery County can remain economically competitive within the changing and growing metropolitan region. A BRT system can help attract and retain the employers and residents that build our communities---and our tax base. The Transit Task Force draft proposal shows how an Independent Transit Authority could help build and finance a BRT system fully and efficiently, and could ensure a dedicated funding source for transit. I hope officials consider using the most progressive and fair financing structure possible, perhaps by employing an income, automobile, and/or road use tax, rather than a sales tax. BRT provides an alternative to all of us who would prefer not to drive--who would rather read and relax on our commutes than to get stressed out by someone cutting us off in traffic. It is an alternative for those of us who can't drive because of the costs of car ownership--or because of age, or mental or physical disabilities. The question before us is not one of "car drivers vs. bus riders". Chances are, most of us have been--or will be--both car users and transit users at some point in our lives, sometimes even within a single day. BRT can serve us all, from someone like my nephew, who is old enough to ride the bus alone, but too young to drive, to my parents, who could more easily age in place at their home near Viers Mill Road if there was a transit station around the corner. It can serve any of us, who for whatever our personal, economic, environmental, or lifestyle reasons, would choose BRT if it was available. The proposed BRT system can help connect our communities, preserve our environment, and grow our economy. I hope policy makers commit to this investment and to the future of our county and build BRT now. Thank you.

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 4:42 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 8:41:28 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Garrett Hennigan
Email: garrett.hennigan@waba.org

Comment: I had signed up to testify at the September 30 Task Force Hearing. Unfortunately, I am no longer able to attend the hearing, but will submit written testimony. I realize that it is probably too late, but please remove my name from the testimony list. Thank you, Garrett Hennigan Washington Area Bicyclist Association

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 3:37 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 7:37:12 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Margaret Schoap
Email: tamecoalition@gmail.com

Comment: Supporting A New Independent Transit Authority To: Transit Task Force My name is Margaret Schoap, and I am speaking on behalf of the TAME Coalition, who collaborates with citizens and government to secure Transit Alternatives for Mid-County Highway Extended (TAME). The TAME Coalition supports allowing Montgomery County to create a single-focused independent transit authority to perform county transit functions. We whole-heartedly embrace the County's new Rapid Transit System, the Corridor Cities Transitways route, and our existing Ride-On bus operation. Each of these transit systems must be grounded with reliable and dedicated financial sources for their successful longevity. Montgomery County will not be able to build new and expanded transportation systems by relying on our County's budget, alone. TAME Coalition supports creating an Independent Transit Authority now, rather than later. The TAME Coalition supports four key fundamentals for an effective ITA: ➤ Implement first-round RTS routes in (hopefully) five years ➤ Determine revenue sources that are predictable and dedicated ➤ Distribute the cost equally and fairly to county citizens and transit riders ➤ Be accountable to the public You are an important group that can ensure transit is built and will flourish in Montgomery County. We ask you to pledge your support for an independent transit authority. Respectfully Submitted, Margaret Schoap 11425 Neelsville Church Rd, Germantown, MD 20876 Organizer for Coalition for Transit Alternatives to Mid-County Highway Extended (TAME) tamecoalition@gmail.com
<http://www.tamecoalition.org/> 240-581-0518

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 10:50 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 2:49:12 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Roger A. Lewis

Email: rogeralewis@aol.com

Comment: I have been a resident of Montgomery County since 1965. I vote regularly. I believe that this initiative is flawed. It is outrageously expensive and based on evolving transportation technologies unnecessary. Please disband.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 6:58 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 10:57:55 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: John Andrews
Email: ordandrews@aol.com
Comment: Is it possible to see a draft of the BRT plan online?

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 5:34 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 9:33:30 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: William Henry
Email: bill.henry3@verizon.net

Comment: From one Democrat to another...I am tired of this tax and spend mentality! We already have buses that run on most roads and Montgomery county has two large portions of the red line metro for efficient transportation needs. The cost for this is too high for implementation and maintenance. Implementing this will most certainly make future residents think twice before buying a property here, which will in turn have a negative impact on real estate prices.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 1:25 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 5:24:29 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Jonathan Halpern
Email: jonathandhalpern@gmail.com

Comment: I am a resident of Montgomery County, serve on my civic association board and have worked as a professional infrastructure economist for the past 30 years, including on all manner of transportation services. I, along with many neighbors and friends have serious concerns with the current proposal to create an Independent Transit Authority in Montgomery County. Many are concerned about the impact special property taxes and fees will have on their household budgets and on property values. Others are concerned about the appropriateness and cost effectiveness of the proposed BRT program which those taxes are to help finance. Still others are concerned about the capacity of Montgomery County government to oversee a public authority responsible for a large scale, complex infrastructure program of any sort, including BRT Phase 1, given the county's disappointing track record with even small scale projects like the Silver Spring Transit Center. There is to another fundamental issue which this proposal raises: the central motivation and rationale for creating a semi autonomous transit entity as a vehicle for realizing improvements in county transit services; The purpose for which most urban/suburban transportation authorities have been created is to foster coherency, consistency and coordination in regional/metropolitan transportation policy, planning and operations. The motivation for doing do is the frequent observation that single modal agencies (eg bus, rail, road, traffic management), often across jurisdictions (cities/counties) tend to plan, execute and operate in silos, with inconsistent policies (financial, fiscal, standards, procurement), planning (eg demand forecasting, investment criteria and prioritization, procurement processes) and operations (eg routes/feeders, scheduling, maintenance, traffic management systems), resulting in large gaps, overlaps, cost inefficiencies and rigidities. Some of those entities have the authority to set fare levels and issue bonds but few have taxation authority. Rather, they are recipients of earmarked transportation tax revenues levied by the central taxing authority of their jurisdiction which has the political legitimacy to do so. Most of these entities deal with multiple transit modes and services, not just bus transit, again, to better ensure coherency and coordination across transportation services and networks. Moreover, in many cases, they are not executors of projects nor direct providers of services. This is an important governance attribute. The transportation authority sets broad polices and prioritizes future investments (often projects which other agencies propose, dimension and may execute). This is one way of mitigating the tendency for executing agencies to push their favored

Jonathan Halpern

10/11/15

projects, skewing the planning studies to suit their interests (often "bigger is better") without regard to cost effectiveness across modal and intermodal choices. Another governance attribute of transportation authorities is that the political authority (eg. county executive) does not appoint the authority's board of directors, again to maintain an arms length relations with the politicians who may be subject to intense lobbying pressure by powerful interest groups. How do these attributes stack up with the county executive's ITA Proposal? The ITA seems to be first and foremost about mobilizing debt financing and securing that debt with earmarked taxes and fees which the Authority, itself will propose and levy (with county council no objection). It will use those resources to implement projects in a single mode of transportation-BRT- apparently without making use of standard industry practice in terms of planning protocols and performance criteria, in what appears to be a policy vacuum. For example, BRT corridors appear to have been selected primarily to serve notional future land use developments without regard to existing bus ridership patterns (which are the base for BRT ridership); the proposed BRT service does not appear to address critical corridor-specific bottlenecks (as per ITDP report); BRT service levels were selected without a cost effective plan for service delivery (ie gold plating). These concerns would normally be resolved through a standard planning tool: alternatives analysis. This is meant to objectively compare the cost effectiveness of BRT solutions with realistic non-BRT services to address precisely defined, corridor specific bottlenecks. Such analysis was never done, the absence of which, besides leading to high cost solutions, precludes the county from obtaining federal grants. The Task Force report declares the proposed ITA to be the one and only formulation which addresses the county government's requirement not to exceed its debt affordability ceilings in the belief that the debt which an ITA might issue would not 'count' against this ceiling and hence would provide 'fiscal space' for the county to undertake several mega-projects at once: Phase 1 BRT and the county's share of ongoing costs of the Purple Line as well as others down the road. Not only is this a bad reason to create a semi autonomous agency with powers to expropriate county residents' resources with special taxes and fees. Its very conception is misconstrued as bondholders and their trustees will require county government guarantees of the ITA's contractual debt, given the county council's power to disapprove transportation taxes/fees. Those guarantees represent financial obligations of the county government and thus factor into its indebtedness and creditworthiness. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 10:00 AM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 1:59:49 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Steve Corsini

Email: scorsini10@gmail.com

Comment: Regarding the 4 BILLION DOLLAR BUS program. First off, I don't know how to even start asking or voicing my concerns without first stating, "You must have lost your minds to even be thinking about a 4 BILLION DOLLAR BUS IDEA". How could you people even think of this? Your group is running out of work when you start coming up with whimsical and fanatical ideas like this, which shows me all of you should be fired and maybe a few of you could be repurposed. Either way I digress, since you have actually thought of another way to somehow spend 4 BILLION DOLLARS WHICH DOESN'T EXIST. Which brings me to my first question, since you have indeed thought of a way to spend 4 BILLION DOLLARS THAT DOESN'T EXIST. How are you going to pay for this 4 BILLION DOLLAR project? Where will the money come from for this 4 BILLION DOLLAR BUS PROJECT?? Instead of thinking of ways to burn more money, you people should be thinking about ways to get more efficiency out of the money you do spend. Also, I am aware that many of you probably do not pay very much in taxes because your salaries might be too low, but many of us out here, do PAY A LOT in taxes. And we are completely SICK OF IT. Many of us who are responsible for paying the majorities of the taxes you people like to spend, don't like seeing it spent on things like BUSES THAT WE DON'T EVEN USE. Buses are a form of transportation that 90+% of people who work for a living here in MoCO, DON'T EVEN USE. So, STOP WASTING OUR MONEY. I would love to speak at this meeting and provide some common sense to you people, but apparently the number of people who have signed up is already at 50ppl, otherwise, you all would get a piece of mind because I am sick of paying so much money for crap like BUSES (which, by the way- WE ALREADY HAVE!) and for salaries of people who come up with insane ideas like this. Again, you people should be using your heads to come up with way to SAVE MONEY on things we are already spending money on, and you should not be coming up with NEW WAYS to spend money on things that we don't even have the money for, like a 4 BILLION DOLLAR BUS PROJECT. IT'S INSANE!!!!

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2015 9:40 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 1:40:04 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Hey there..

Email: Leeward@powerhouse.net

Comment: Hi there!, We are offering an online 100% free website audit, find out 100% free...:
Things you can do YOURSELF to rank instantly faster in Google and outrank your competition Who is talking about you online? What is your online reputation like? Do you have broken links? Quick fixes to get more traffic to your site Is your website mobile friendly in Google's eyes (from April if not your rankings will of dropped) And ton's of facts and fixes to get more traffic! This is all free, no card numbers needed, of course after you get your free report (takes about an hour to email it to you) if you wish us to help you with any issues you find then feel free to give us a call on the number provided on your audit. <http://arrowupmarketing.net> Hey there.. <http://arrowupmarketing.net>

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Street, Thomas
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 4:01 PM
To: White, Julie; Vu, Thuan
Subject: FW: Sept. 30 meeting comments

I am not sure where the messages are being stored, but put this one with them.

Tom

From: Driscoll, Lorraine
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 3:55 PM
To: Street, Thomas
Subject: Sept. 30 meeting comments

Tom,

Below are comments that Mr. Hunter tried to submit to the Transit Task Force "Contact Us" page when it wasn't working. (He's the one who informed us.)

The "Contact Us" is working now, but I guess Mr. Hunter wasn't sure about that, so he submitted the below comments to me. I told him I would pass them along to the Transit Task Force: Thanks for adding his comments to others that are being submitted.

~ Lorraine

From: Tom Hunter <tomhunter@operamail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 3:40 PM
To: Driscoll, Lorraine
Subject: re: Sept. 30 meeting comments

Please forward to someone at the forum.
I wish to remark to the forum:

I have suffered an injury, which has left me legally blind. I now have a MetroAccess card, and travel by rail or bus. I have noticed, with the limited sight that remains, that Montgomery County bus service has done better, than the Metro rail service, which often just reads 'RED' (or another line) on the sign at the end of a rail car. The bus will show more useful info, like the upcoming street stop. There is also a verbal (audio) indication, which is clearer than the voice on the train that is often hard to hear.

I thank the county for this, and wish to encourage the funding of bus service between points on the Red Line, which would bridge across, between Wheaton and Rockville or such, with designated bus lanes on Viers Mill Road and frequent bus service. This would be more do-able than an expansion of rail service, and would be of benefit to the county at large.

Tom Hunter - 9/22/15

Thanks,

--

Tom Hunter

tomhunter@operamail.com

On Wed, Sep 16, 2015, at 04:47 PM, Driscoll, Lorraine wrote:

Dear Sir,

We received your voice mail about a Sept. 30th issue. If you're calling about the Transit Task Force Forum

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Saturday, September 19, 2015 12:32 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Saturday, September 19, 2015 4:31:55 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: linda galloway
Email: lindae350@verizon.net

Comment: I am opposed to the ITA, this will give them free range to levy taxes on us. I am already tax too much, I cannot afford to keep living in this county with these tax increase due to over spending. We do not need all this building, congesting this area even more. It will not benefit the residents, only the builders and the tax revenue this will generate. Enough already, I am not interested in taking a bus, it is highly inconvenient for me. We need the lesser cost method, improving the local lines only.

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2015 9:53 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Saturday, September 19, 2015 1:52:29 AM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Carolyn Weber

Email: chweber102@gmail.com

Comment: Just what we need, another long-term tax. This is ridiculous, and county residents will not put up with it. -Carolyn Weber Silver Spring

Thanks

White, Julie

From: Cexapps CEX
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2015 5:24 PM
To: Street, Thomas; White, Julie; Winston, Mark
Subject: FW: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

From: NoReply@App.MontgomeryCountyMD.gov
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2015 9:24:14 PM (UTC) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Cexapps CEX
Subject: Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us

Transit Task Force 2015 - Contact Us:

Name: Marie Dennis
Email: mimidennis@yahoo.com
Comment: SAY NO TO THE BRT! It is a terrible idea; it's too heavy a tax burden on MoCo citizens and homeowners; it will destroy the charm and quality of life for huge sectors of Silver Spring/White Oak/Four Corners; and it is an untenable, ridiculous solution. SAY NO!
SAY NO! SAY NO!

Thanks